Pages 1 - 58

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable William H. Orrick, Judge

DELPHINE ALLEN; et al.,

Plaintiffs,

VS. NO. C 00-04599 WHO

CITY OF OAKLAND; et al.,

Defendants.

San Francisco, California Wednesday, April 3, 2019

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs:

JAMES B. CHANIN LAW OFFICES

3050 Shattuck Avenue

Berkeley, California 94705

BY: JAMES B. CHANIN, ATTORNEY AT LAW

LAW OFFICES OF JOHN L. BURRIS

Airport Corporate Center

7677 Oakport Street - Suite 1120

Oakland, California 94621

BY: JOHN L. BURRIS, ATTORNEY AT LAW

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

REPORTED BY: Jo Ann Bryce, CSR No. 3321, RMR, CRR, FCRR

Official Reporter

1	APPEARANCES:	(CONTINUE	ED)
2	For Defendants	:	OPPIGE OF MAR GIFTY AFFRONMEN
3			OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza - 6th Floor Oakland, California 94612
4		BY:	KIMBERLY A. BLISS, SUPERVISING DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
5			VERONICA L. HARRIS, Deputy City Attorney BARBARA J. PARKER, CITY ATTORNEY
6			DAVID PEREDA, SPECIAL COUNSEL
7	For Intervenor	Oakland	Police Officers Association: RAINS LUCIA STERN ST. PHALLE
8			& SILVER PC 2300 Contra Costa Blvd Suite 500
9		BY:	Pleasant Hill, California 94523 ROCKNE A. LUCIA, JR., ATTORNEY AT LAW
10	Also Present:	Also Present:	Mayor Libby Schaaf
11			Sabrina Landreth, City Administrator Police Chief Anne Kirkpatrick
12			Darren Allison, Acting Assistant Chief Oliver Cunningham, Deputy Chief
13			Leronne Armstrong, Deputy Chief Virginia Gleason, Deputy Director
14			Kirk Coleman, Captain Sekou Millington, Captain
15			Serou millington, captain
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

Wednesday - April 3, 2019 1 3:37 p.m. 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 THE CLERK: We are here in Case Number 00-4599, Allen, 4 5 et al., versus City of Oakland, et al. 6 Counsel, if you would please come forward and state your appearance for the record. 7 MR. CHANIN: James Chanin for plaintiffs, Your Honor. 8 MR. BURRIS: John Burris for the plaintiffs, 9 Your Honor. Good afternoon. 10 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 11 MS. BLISS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 12 Kimberly Bliss for the City and County. 13 THE COURT: Ms. Bliss. 14 MS. BLISS: Sorry. I used to work for San Francisco 15 16 too often. We're just a city. The City of Oakland. 17 With me I have Barbara Parker, the City Attorney; a number of other attorneys from her office, including David Pereda and 18 19 Veronica Harris. I also have City Administrator Sabrina 20 Landreth, Mayor Libby Schaaf, and the Chief of Police Anne 21 Kirkpatrick. THE COURT: And, Ms. Bliss, I understand this may be 22 23 your last appearance in this court; is that true? MS. BLISS: It is, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: I've enjoyed having you here. You've done 25

an excellent job as an advocate.

MS. BLISS: Thank you very much.

MR. LUCIA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Rocky Lucia for intervenor Oakland POA.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

All right. So I've read the joint status conference statement, the City's 3/22 status report, the FRB report on the officer-involved shooting in March of 2018, Chief Kirkpatrick's and the compliance director's addendums to it, and the independent monitor's report.

Let me tell you what I know from those documents. Number one, at the last status I emphasized my concern that the Oakland Police Department was not reporting use of force incidents accurately, which undermined its credibility with the Court. Since then I note that the Department has referred several officers and supervisors for Internal Affairs investigations and possible disciplinary action and that it's rewriting its use of force policies and modifying definitions, training, and undertaking internal audits. So that's great.

I also note that there has been an uptick in Level 3 uses of force, and I'm interested in OPD's explanation for that.

Number two, OPD's data shows that the number of stops in Oakland has fallen dramatically. Assuming that that information is reported accurately, that's very important and a very positive accomplishment. 55 percent of those stops are

still of African Americans, basically the same percentage as in the past. I'm interested in how OPD is addressing that racial disparity.

Number three, the City has completed 42 of the 50 Stanford recommendations.

Number four, the City is on track to implement PRIME 2.0, now known as VISION, in July on schedule. This has been an important priority and, if implemented and used to its potential, will be a valuable technological tool supporting constitutional policing.

Number five, complaints by citizens are trending up. Why is that? I look forward to the City's analysis of this, as well as to the monitor's perspective and analysis down the road.

Number six, concerns are also reported from Oakland Black Officers Association. I'm going to address that in a moment.

Number seven, regarding the City's response to the officer-involved shooting, that raised concerns with respect to compliance with Task 5 concerning complaint procedures for IAD; 24, use of force reporting policy; 25, use of force investigation and report responsibilities; 30, Executive Force Review Board; and 31, officer-involved shooting investigations.

I've reactivated Tasks 24, 25, and 31 in November. OPD has proposed remedial steps to better address interaction with the homeless and people who are unconscious, which is a good

start.

So I don't really need any presentation that rehashes those facts.

Now I'm going to tell you what my concerns are. The genesis of this Court's involvement in this case was the culture in OPD that allowed the Riders to flourish. The purpose of all the policies and procedures required by the NSA was to provide a structure within which cultural change to constitutional policing could occur, but all the great policies in the world will not ensure cultural change. That comes from leadership, principled, ethical, courageous leadership from the top that permeates throughout the organization.

It's leadership that is not transactional. It demands the best and it keeps its eyes on the prize, and the prize is not ending court involvement with OPD, although that would be a great by-product. The prize is constitutional policing, and anything less than that is insufficient.

The defendant in this case is the City of Oakland and ultimately the responsibility for OPD's 15 years under court supervision and the wholehearted implementation of the NSA lies with City leaders, starting with the mayor. Expectations are set at the top and the demand for excellence must run through the entire structure of the Police Department.

With that in mind, concerns about recruiting, hiring, and hearing the grievances of African American, Latino, Asian, and

women officers is of great significance to me. When it comes to cultural change, their concerns are of particular interest.

Proactive rather than reactive responses to issues is critical. For example, credibility of data regarding the use of force; failure to address policies, practices, and procedures regarding the homeless and unconscious, which should have occurred after the first incident resulting in the death of a citizen, not the second. Outside experts should not be the force propelling OPD to constitutional policing. That should be internal coming from the mayor on down.

Cultural change is hard. It's not about paper compliance or checking boxes. Officers' conduct and interactions with the community are the products of leadership and supervision of the front-line supervisors, their commanders, and the executives above them.

So what I'm looking for is the manifestation of cultural change concerning all of those issues that we've been talking about since I took over.

So with that, Ms. Bliss.

MS. BLISS: Thank you, Your Honor.

So as you know, this is my last case management conference and I have generally made the City's substantive presentations over the last two years; but to Your Honor's point, exactly what you've just spoken about, cultural change and understanding within the City and the command structure, we had

decided even before we got here today that we needed to do something a little different for Your Honor.

I will not be making the City's substantive presentation. You will be hearing from commanders in the Department itself, and some of them do have prepared remarks. They will try not to repeat anything that the Court just said. These presentations are as to what you want to hear and speak directly to those issues.

The Department's clearly faced some challenges over the last six months, and in prior court orders and in CMC conferences, you have mentioned that you want to, you know, hold commanders accountable and hear from them when necessary.

And in the past monitor's report, the monitor questioned whether the Department fully understands its responsibilities under the NSA. The commanders are here to tell you that they do.

This is a large organization. They have difficult conversations every day about these matters, and they are examining these issues wholeheartedly and transparently, and not just trying to check boxes but affect cultural change.

Sometimes that takes time, but we want you to hear from them.

They bear primary responsibility for the tasks and the NSA-related projects that we spoke about in the CMC. Our intent here today is to focus on the few that we think are the biggest issues and that Your Honor brought up, particularly

force reporting and the recent ruling by the compliance director that the Department is out of compliance on Task 30 regarding EFRBs.

We will also address the OBOA concerns that Your Honor has just brought up.

So I think that the way that -- we knew that we wanted to hear what the Court wanted to hear about and that I would play a little bit of, for lack of a better term, ringmaster here.

Our intention would be to have Acting Assistant Chief Darren Allison come up first and speak specifically to the issues on use of force reporting and the EFRB process and the command response to the entire issue surrounding the EFRB and the Pawlik investigation.

Then I think we will have Deputy Director Virginia Gleason come up and speak a little bit with respect to the recruiting of communities of color and women into the hiring and background process.

And I believe both she and the chief, who would like to speak last, will directly address the OBOA issue and how the Department is addressing that. I realize that is one thing, as it was somewhat new as we were filing our CMC statement, that we didn't include so -- but they have taken some definite steps in the last week or two and will be able to communicate to you what we're going to do there.

We do, however, have other commanders here ready to speak

```
to any of the other tasks, including Deputy Chief Leronne
 1
     Armstrong on Task 34, stop data, the risk management process,
 2
     and the Stanford 50 recommendations; Captain Sekou Millington,
 3
     who's the commander of Internal Affairs, if Your Honor has any
 4
 5
     specific questions related to Task 5, 45, or the discipline
     disparity study; and Captain Kirk Coleman, who will be filling
 6
     in for Acting Deputy Chief Roland Holmgren, who unfortunately
 7
     is out of town, on data regarding recent rises in pursuits and
 8
     collisions.
 9
10
          The one thing I would add is Your Honor did say that you
11
     would like to hear about the rise in the complaints, our
     analysis, and the monitor's analysis at a future date. That is
12
     the one thing that we are looking into and we do not have
13
     definitive answers yet, but I would expect that Captain
14
15
     Millington would have some definitive answers for you by the
16
     next case management conference.
17
              THE COURT:
                         All right.
              MS. BLISS: So with that and the Court's permission,
18
19
     I'd like to turn it over to Acting Assistant Chief Darren
20
     Allison.
21
              THE COURT:
                          Great.
22
              MS. BLISS:
                          Thank you.
23
              ACTING ASST. CHIEF ALLISON: Good afternoon,
     Your Honor.
24
25
                          Good afternoon.
              THE COURT:
```

ACTING ASST. CHIEF ALLISON: My name is Darren

Allison. I am the Acting Assistant Chief for the Oakland

Police Department. I'm responsible for Tasks 24, 25, and 30,

which, as you know, are associated with use of force and force review boards.

I completely have the message received. I had a prepared response but as you've articulated, you know a lot about what I was prepared to say, so I'm going to try and piecemeal some of the things I think you may be particularly interested in.

So I want to start by saying that our Department values the protection and sanctity of a human life. We are committed to accomplishing this police mission with respect and minimal reliance on the use of physical force. We recognize that law enforcement officers are entrusted with tremendous power and authority, and for the legitimacy of our organization and to ensure public trust it is important that we do not misuse this power.

Further, we must continue to review and analyze force encounters providing ongoing training for our officers. We must get it right to ensure officer safety and public safety.

So I'm going to give you just a little tidbit of some

Tasks 24 and 25 and a little bit about Task 30. I'm not going

to rehash the things that the Court already is aware of.

I will start and go right to the heart of the matter on Tasks 24 and 25 when it comes to our policy modification. We

are in the process of modifying our use of force policy to provide clarity, particularly around interpretation of the policy and reporting. These changes are meant to ensure the complete reporting of force, the collection of data anytime officers use force, and a review and investigation of force.

We have completed a draft special order to modify the applicable policy General Order K-4. The draft policy has been shared with plaintiffs' attorney Mr. Chanin and a member of the Police Commission. We have also shared it with the IMT. In fact, prior to the CMC, we had a productive conversation about that special order with the IMT and Mr. Chanin and received really pointed feedback that we're going to take back and incorporate in our future modifications.

As you know, this policy falls within the jurisdiction of the Police Commission. Therefore, we have requested the Police Commission to establish an ad hoc committee to review and provide feedback on the policy. Once established, we will work with the ad hoc policy committee to complete our collaboration in an expeditious manner.

When the policy is presented to the full Commission, they will have 120 days to accept or reject the policy. Once we complete the Police Commission stage in the policy development, we will then need to meet and confer with the OPOA. We will continue to work with stakeholders on the policy changes with the goal to publish the draft special order within the next six

months.

And I think it's important to know that although the policy development process can be lengthy, we did not wait for the completion of the process to act. Last September the chief issued a directive to provide immediate retraining to all field officers about the pointing of a firearm and reporting the type of force.

Since the training, the Department saw an immediate increase in the reported Level 4 uses of force, and I think that was the marked increase that you saw in your analysis, Your Honor, when it came to the increases.

We did also see an increase in Level 3s, but the numbers are, just to give you some concept, fairly low compared to the Level 4s. We saw a range per month of Level 3 uses of force anywhere from 6 in one month to a high of 14 in one month.

And Level 3s are typically associated with what we see kind of on a repetitive basis in our Department associated with takedowns. So unfortunately I don't have the deep-dive analysis as to what changed in the variance from 6 to 13 per month, but where we saw the huge leap was with the pointing of a firearm, which went from about in the 20s to 50s to the hundreds per month, and we believe that that was a part of our lineup and field officer training with the pointing of a firearm.

So a couple other things I wanted to point out before I

move to Task 30 is some other things we're looking at as we continue to assess our performance as an organization is outlier actions when it comes to force-to-arrest ratios. So historically we've always looked at high force-to-arrest or force-to-complaint ratios what we are doing in our risk management meetings.

And we are also looking at low force-to-arrest ratios and really to look at squads, officers, divisions that are engaging in a lot of arrests but may not have a lot of uses of force to kind of act as a point to see if things are being reported appropriately, are being reviewed appropriately or investigated appropriately.

There was also another concern in a recent monitor's report where the consumers expressed that there was an inherent failure to address Force Review Board deliverables in a timely fashion. As of today, they have completed over 40 tasks with an additional seven to be completed. Four of those seven I anticipate will be completed in the next couple of weeks.

As we continue to hold Force Boards, we will continue to add to the list; and in that light, we are also exploring new technology to better task and track board deliverables.

So as I transition, I'm going to transition to Task 30 and Executive Force Review Boards.

THE COURT: Okay. Before you do that -ACTING ASST. CHIEF ALLISON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- are you confident today that the data that you're collecting regarding use of force is accurate?

ACTING ASST. CHIEF ALLISON: Your Honor, I think it's -- officers are -- in my opinion, are reporting force in a manner that is if you're in doubt, to report it. I think that there's cleanup that needs to be done with our special order where there is subjectivity that needs to be less subjective and more objective.

I honestly believe, especially since 2012, we've had about 488 new officers in our 750-officer Police Department that have come on under this force policy that want to do the right thing, but I think the subjectivity lends themselves to that interpretation that we can't afford.

And so when it comes to a culture change, this is what they know, but I think the policy needs to give them objective guidance to know what do I need to do and what not to do. And I think that our current draft will get that objectivity there and rely less on subjectivity where we can really be accurate in the data to a precise degree.

THE COURT: Okay.

ACTING ASST. CHIEF ALLISON: So for Task 30, we recently, as you noted, were found out of compliance as a result of the recent EFRB regarding the officer-involved shooting that resulted in the unfortunate death of Joshua Pawlik. Prior to this EFRB, the Department held 17 EFRBs over

the past seven years. All the EFRBs were conducted in compliance with the NSA and Department policy.

Our CMC statement has covered why the Department believes the EFRB process for the Pawlik OIS is compliant with both the NSA and Department policy. We recognize, however, there's always room for improvement.

As with all our Force Boards, the Pawlik OIS presented the Department with an opportunity to review our training, tactics, supervision, and investigation-related critical incidents to ensure best practices. To that end, we are working on the following:

First, the chief has directed the Department's trainers and subject-matter experts to outline tactical considerations and strategies for safely mitigating the high-risk incidents, particularly incidents that involve sleeping, unconscious, or unresponsive armed individuals.

Our training -- our trainers have already incorporated training for these incidents into current reality-based scenario practical exercises and classroom education. The training will be delivered in the academy and in-service continued professional training.

To enhance the training, the chief has also directed trainers to engage other agencies around the country and review their policies and procedures and training for critical incidents involving unresponsive armed individuals.

Further, the Department has been reviewing our own past encounters with sleeping or unresponsive armed individuals. Since 2016, OPD has responded to 11 incidences where officers encountered sleeping or unresponsive armed individuals that did not result in an officer-involved shooting. Of the 11 incidents, 9 were resolved with individuals being detained with no force or minimal force. In 2 of the incidents, the individuals fled and eluded capture.

The Department will review these incidents to identify noteworthy tactics and/or lessons learned. The Department will also partner with the Police Commission in developing a protocol for handling high-risk incidents, including a policy to focus on addressing sleeping, unconscious, or unresponsive armed individuals, the use of designated arrest teams, and the use of armored vehicles. As always, the policy will be shared with the IMT and the plaintiffs' counsel.

For the second part of the strategy, the chief has ordered a team of CID and IAD commanders to explore improvements to the Department's investigation of serious uses of force. The Bureau of Investigations Deputy Chief Oliver Cunningham is working on modifications to the homicide section policy and procedure as it relates to officer-involved shooting investigations. Deputy Chief Cunningham is here if Your Honor would like additional details in that endeavor.

Finally, the Department is examining the EFRB process for

potential improvements, including developing a proposal for incorporating additional voting or nonvoting EFRB members from outside the Department.

I want to assure Your Honor that Force Board members undertake their duties with great attention to detail and with understanding of the gravity and consequences of the issues being discussed.

As a learning organization, we will continue to critically and objectively evaluate our performance. So with that, I'm sure Your Honor may have some questions for me and I'd be happy to answer any other pointed questions for you.

THE COURT: I'm not going to dig in at the moment to those questions so thank you very much.

ACTING ASST. CHIEF ALLISON: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. BLISS: I'd like to call up Deputy Director
Virginia Gleason, who is over background and recruiting and
will speak to some of the issues regarding the OBOA letter and
any other.

THE COURT: Great. Good afternoon.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR GLEASON: Good afternoon.

Virginia Gleason, Deputy Director at OPD. I'm overseeing a bureau of services that has IT and PRIME and now VISION, as well as personnel, background, recruiting, the Com Center, records, and several support services.

Would you like to hear anything about the current status

of PRIME? Because we do have a few updated things this week if that's of interest to you.

THE COURT: Well, are you on track to have everything ready by July? That's what I'm really interested in.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR GLEASON: We are on track to have the system operational by July, but one of -- as you're talking about cultural change, we have one key component of the system which we are going to be able to do the first entry-level demonstration tomorrow with the monitoring team that shows how we have changed how this data is going to be available to supervisors both in the ease of use of it to monitor behavior, as well as the recency of the data.

Currently for those risk management meetings, I realize that you have seen one of them, that data is six weeks old because that's the way we have to gather it. The new system that will be operational this summer, the data will be 24 hours old, and we will not have to have a third party gather together the information to package it for the supervisors to use. It will be immediately available the next day by squad, by area. They'll be able to do all those drill-downs without having to have that time lag, and they'll also be able to spread out and look at trends over longer periods of time.

So we're very excited that that's coming along, and we're happy to do -- the demonstration of the -- the single dashboard that's working so far and the one that we selected that we

thought would be the most timely would be to show them how supervisors now will be able to look at use of force information that is only 24 hours old.

THE COURT: And so do you have the expertise in-house to make the best use of this system, and are you confident that the people that you're conveying this information to also understand how VISION works and will be able to implement it to its fullest potential?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR GLEASON: I'm very happy you asked that because I have a couple other great pieces of news. One of them -- well, first of all, the system is so much easier to use than what we had before. What most people knew PRIME as just this very clunky, slow, difficult-to-use, there was not any intuitive path of how to use the system, that has significantly changed.

But the other part that's helpful is we're getting technical assistance from the monitoring team as we're creating the system, and they're giving us some suggestions about periods of time that it's helpful to look at long-term trends and when you want to have a shorter period of time to look at maybe squad-related trends, as well as things as simple as how you put the data together on a particular bar chart. If you have something like complaints that there's a very high number of them, you might want to put them separate than also have something with a low number, like pursuits, because it will

artificially deflate any increase. So you may go from two pursuits to eight pursuits, which would be, you know, a very significant increase but it's going to look relatively small if you put it on a chart together with items that are in the hundreds.

So things -- that was very helpful. We worked with our developers and they're helping us so that we can look at those things in isolation so those differences are more meaningful and more understandable.

I think it would be -- we'd be very happy to give a demonstration and show how supervisors are going to be using it. By the time of our next CMC, we will have the system built out in its entirety and we'll be able to give a wonderful demo, but we have the first mini one that we're doing tomorrow. I got a preview of it this morning and I was very pleased.

The part that I think is helpful as far as the long-term sustainability, we have two hires which are imminent. One is a hire that's actually going to be in the City IT Department and it is a deputy CIO who will be a director of public safety.

I know a lot of people talk about how you can't recruit good people into government. We have outstanding candidates and our hard part was screening it down to interview 10 because they were all so very qualified and interested in the job.

Those interviews take place the week -- on the 15th, 16th, 17th of April we will have the interviews for those positions.

The other position that we've been talking about that came as a result of the Stanford recommendations so that we have a data manager in our office, that position also has been advertised, and we worked closely with the City's HR Department so that it was in the appropriate description and pay band that we would attract good people.

We have had -- we have several applicants. We'll be looking at them. We also had so many great applicants for the deputy CIO job, that we've asked our HR Department to reach out to the people who didn't make the cut for interviews and ask them if they would also like to be considered for the data manager job because some of these people specifically were interested in a job with law enforcement, and there's not very many like the one we're looking at.

So we will have some permanent internal people who will be able to help us with the data. We're also bringing in some internal trainers and some other folks. So that part is going very, very well.

Okay.

Go on to recruiting.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR GLEASON: Okay, recruiting. So the last time we were here it was during a period of time where there was a question about a particular waiver that we had and whether, as part of that waiver, we were asking applicants

whether they had ever been a victim of sexual assault.

Great.

THE COURT:

As it turns out, that wasn't what was happening, but it

did reveal to us that we had a whole bunch of really old waivers that we hadn't looked at very closely for a long time, and that event caused us to go through and start looking at the details of our hiring forms and comparing them with what POST has and making the ones individual to Oakland when necessary.

As we started doing that, we decided -- we just recently had some very big success in staffing our Com Center, and we looked at some of the improvements and the ways that we streamline processes in that to see if we could apply those as well to hiring the police officer trainees.

One of the things that has been my experience, and I have been working hiring police officers for almost 20 years, and for a brief period of time, well, I took a medical leave for a member of my family, I ran a company that all they did was police backgrounding and hiring for several dozen departments in the state of Washington, and we ran through thousands and thousands of people every year, and I learned some streamlining tools.

My experience, as well as other -- the experience of other people is if you have a streamlined process that does not have large gaps, you tend to be able to increase the diversity of your hiring pool. One particular type of hiring and recruiting that specifically will attract a larger female applicant pool is if you vary the dates and times and locations of where you test. For whatever reason, women tend not to be as flexible in

their schedules and if your only tests are on Saturdays or the third Saturday of the month, you tend to get a less diverse pool.

About a year and a half ago, our recruiting section reached out and found resources so that they could dramatically expand the locations, dates, and times where they did testing. What we found was that did dramatically increase the size, diversity, and the geographic range of our pool but it was giving us a larger group to work with.

Then we had to work on streamlining recruiting and backgrounding practices in our Department because now we had --- we have widened the funnel so large and we felt it was a priority to move people through quickly. We had to come up with ways to make sure that we weren't letting things fall between the cracks.

The concerns -- and I'm not specifically addressing, you know, other issues that I think the chief is going to talk about later -- I went through and I rescreened people for the last year, and what I saw was an attempt to make the effort to respond to some of the things that came up as a result of the sex scandal case where we said we really want to be very careful in hiring and recruiting.

I certainly didn't see anything that caused me alarm. The couple areas where I did have a lot of concern and where we are making some changes are going back and trying to make sure that

we're revalidating our physical requirements to make sure that they are definitely validated and job relevant to the essential job functions. Our last validation was in 2005 so we are working to get that done again because sometimes if your physical requirements aren't matched up to your current essential job functions, you unintentionally exclude a lot of people.

Now that we've sped up the testing and the backgrounding process, we're finding that our pools are much larger and we have more viable candidates. The experience we had in Dispatch was we have more candidates than we have spots and we have a waiting list for people to come in, but it allowed us to feel like we could spend more time doing really background and hiring processes that were very much linked to the central job functions.

We made a couple other changes. We're looking at ways to recruit women in different ways through a wider variety of outreach. We've looked at ways to use social media better because that definitely is more appealing to the generation of people we're trying to attract. So we have a social media coordinator specifically working on that.

But the other thing is with our chief and, you know, frankly our City administration from the top all the way down is very appealing to women, and so we're trying to figure out how to leverage that because having a female mayor and a female

chief and a female City administrator is very striking to a lot of people. There's not a lot of cities that can say that. So we're trying to build on that because they have the opportunity to go out and speak a lot of places and then try to scoop up interest as soon as we can.

We're also doing some special weekend hiring events that we're trying to focus on women.

I think that important message about women in policing, we focus on the number of sworn officers but the City of Oakland, there's 40 percent of us, myself included, who are not sworn officers who play a very meaningful role in the culture of the Department, have as many contacts with the public. And so we have eight kind of high-level managerial positions in the Department, seven of them are held by women, including managing our budget, and that is very influential in the Police Department. The one that is not filled by a woman is vacant. We're currently hiring for it.

So I think that when we look at the totality of the numbers and how we hire and how we're trying to encourage women to come to the Department, we really need to look at the Department as a whole. Like I say, I am a civilian but I am at the deputy chief level. I have one of the largest bureaus in the Department, and I think that we shouldn't discount that when we look at the numbers.

One of the other things we are considering, because we're

at about 14 percent women in our Department, which is a couple percentage points bigger than the national average, but it's hard to get women in policing at all. There are just certain aspects of policing that are not always friendly to women so we have looked at those departments that have more success for doing things like job shares and other opportunities. So we're looking at those and also other things that are friendly to women as they grow and they manage families, and we've explored those, some with our City administrator and with members of the City Council that we have talked to, and they have been overwhelmingly supportive of exploring these ideas because some of them are not cheap. They cost money. So we really have been encouraged about the amount of support that we've got all the way up through the City.

What we really want to do is figure out ways that we can make it as friendly to women as other people, kind of level whatever the cultural social playing fields are in the Department. We really want to make it a destination for women. We have a lot of women in our Department that have pretty deep roots in the Department -- in the community. Both of our public media officers are women. They're out there, you know, in the community a lot. We have other women throughout the ranks that are heavily involved in the community, and we are trying to take those relationships and encourage across the Department, whether it's in the training or in the -- you know,

what we make available for women with families, trying to make 1 it friendly to women. 2 So far our academy that started last Monday was 20 percent 3 women, which is pretty amazing. We would have had one other, 4 5 but she had a medical issue that she wasn't able to attend. 6 we're pleased with that and we are hoping that that's going to continue. 7 THE COURT: That's a lot better than zero. 8 9 Congratulations. **DEPUTY DIRECTOR GLEASON:** It is a lot better than 10 Thanks. 11 zero. 12 THE COURT: Thank you. Your Honor, I think the chief would like 13 MS. BLISS: to speak to you and address also the OBOA issue. 14 15 I did want to offer one other, although I don't want to 16 impinge too much on the plaintiffs' time. Your Honor made one 17 comment in the introductory statements about the drop in stops, 18 and I can understand your concern about the validity of that 19 data given the issues we've had around force reporting. 20 would probably take only two minutes for Deputy Chief Armstrong 21 to come up and tell you how we have validated that data and why we feel that that --22 23

THE COURT: All right.

24

25

-- if that is --MS. BLISS:

THE COURT: That's fine. **DEPUTY CHIEF ARMSTRONG:** Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

DEPUTY CHIEF ARMSTRONG: Leronne Armstrong, Deputy Chief of Police assigned to the Bureau of Field Operations, East End.

So Your Honor I believe had some questions around the validity of the data. So before we even release the new numbers around the new stop data, reductions that we pushed out in the CMC, we wanted to make sure that we validated it, sir, just based on obviously the issues with the use of force data.

So what we did was assign a group of officers to go back and research our actual CAD data, which is where officers would actually call the Dispatch center and advise them of the actual traffic stop.

Now, a traffic stop obviously for law enforcement is probably one of the most serious circumstances they face. It's the unknown and it's a safety issue; and based on the history of the Police Department, we know based on our own experiences of how critical it is that dispatch understands where we are. So that is a primary core of the Department, is that when you make a stop, you have to put out your location. It's the only way we can actually come and assist you if there's a safety concern.

So what we did was we took the data -- the stop data collection forms that we had that the officer had filled out as

a result of stops, and then we compared those to the actual CAD data, when the officers notified Dispatch that they were actually on a stop. And those two lines -- we graphed them and then those two lines correlated right next to each other, which demonstrated to us that when a stop is made, it is, in most cases, almost always put out over the CAD. And so we've seen the consistency, meaning that when there was a stop, there was a stop data form filled out as it related to that.

And then we also have additional measures where each stop data form is actually reviewed by a supervisor, and so we feel confident that based on that analysis, that the data that we have put before you is actually accurate.

THE COURT: So that's great to hear. Before you go, what about the other issue, the 55 percent of the stops are of African Americans? That was true when the stops were so much higher.

DEPUTY CHIEF ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

THE COURT: What are you doing about that?

DEPUTY CHIEF ARMSTRONG: So I think there's a couple things that we're doing. I think the reductions, first, Your Honor, was a representation of a reduction in footprint. And so the researchers have advised us that there is a reduction in disparity just solely based on the significant decrease in who you actually stop. So going from 31,000 stops to down to 19,000 stops.

THE COURT: It's great. Okay.

DEPUTY CHIEF ARMSTRONG: And then the other issue with disparity is the idea that we now are doing what we call area-wide risk management meetings. And these allow us -- you've been to the risk management where it's at the executive level, but the area level allows the captain to actually begin to question the lieutenant and the sergeant about the individual officer's activity. And now we have captains that are asking supervisors directly: What stops are this officer engaged in? And this is looking at every single stop for every single officer and examining the need to make that stop.

The intelligence factor percentage when we initially started in 2016 hovered around 5 percent, meaning that officers only represented -- only had 5 percent of information -- only had information 5 percent of the time prior to making a stop.

That number now is around -- a little bit over 30 percent. So we know that now our officers are making more intelligent stops meaning that they have much more information before they make the stops.

But driving down disparities comes along with a different focus, and so one of the things that Chief Kirkpatrick has piloted in one district, in District 2, was to do what we call a beat focus, being that not allowing the officers in that district to make traffic stops outside of their particular beat to see if that helps to drive down disparity by saying to the

officer "You should only be making these sort of traffic-related stops on your particular beat." And so we've seen some success in Area 2 with their disparity coming down as well.

And so we'll continue to pilot those things. We obviously know that there is no model in the country right now that can actually show us that this works, and so we're trying different ways in which to bring down disparity, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. Thank you.

CHIEF KIRKPATRICK: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Chief.

CHIEF KIRKPATRICK: Thank you for giving me the privilege of addressing you personally in court today. I want to get to the heart of the matter by saying that I believe there are two questions you have of me. The first is: Do I really get it when it comes to reform? And the second question is: Is the Oakland Police Department going backwards under my leadership?

I can emphatically answer, yes, not only do I get reform, I understand transformation. You get the culture change when hearts and minds change.

I can also answer emphatically, no, we are not going backwards under my leadership.

I have been a police officer for over 30 years, a chief for almost 20 years. I'm also a licensed attorney and have

been for almost 29 years.

I am not a neophyte when it comes to reviewing and applying legal and policy standards and making decisions regarding the legitimate use of force. In fact, I was a sitting chief when two of my former officers were prosecuted for unlawful uses of force, and even one went to prison for almost four years.

I know that this is not the time or the place to litigate the specifics of the Joshua Pawlik shooting, but I do not want you to know -- or I do want you to know that I did not simply sign off on the recommendations that were made to me by the Internal Affairs and the Executive Force Review Board. I personally reviewed all of the evidence and the lengthy EFRB report. I sought counsel. I discussed the evidence and considered the views of individuals in the Department and the City who are familiar with the standards governing excessive force. This included members of the City Attorney's Office; the former president of the City's Police Commission, who is also a lawyer; and a retired federal magistrate, both of whom observed all three days of the Executive Force Review Board. I also considered the views of those outside of the Department.

This is my usual and consistent process in important cases involving use of force because different people look at evidence with different viewpoints.

I have said and I will continue to say that reasonable

people can disagree. Indeed, this is why we can get split decisions in juries and why some judicial decisions get overturned in Courts of Appeal.

I feel it is important that you understand my personal process, not only in this matter but in all future matters, and know that I have been thorough, I have been complete, and I have been intellectually honest in my decision-making.

But, more importantly, you should understand that in every case involving the use of deadly force, the Department is, indeed, committed to a thorough examination of its practices and procedures in hopes of minimizing or avoiding a similar use of force in the future.

That is why I have ordered that the Department examine and improve its training curriculums and protocols for responding specifically to sleeping and unresponsive persons armed with a gun. This unfortunately is not an atypical situation in Oakland and it does usually end peacefully.

As part of our review, we will examine the tactics of similar calls for service involving unresponsive persons armed with a gun that did not involve the use of deadly force to see what lessons can be learned and applied to our new training curriculum and protocols.

Turning to the second question, the Oakland Police

Department is definitely not going backwards nor is it stalled out. We are indeed moving forward.

I came here to be a part of the reform and transformation of not only Oakland but policing in America. What happens in Oakland does affect American policing. I believe in the Oakland Police Department, and I do believe that the men and women of this Department have received very little public acknowledgment for their enormous accomplishments.

The Department is, indeed, leading the nation in stop data, collection, and how to ask meaningful questions of that data. We have totally transformed how we do day-to-day policing. We practice precision-paced and intelligence-led policing. We are reducing our racial disparity percentages, which means we have stopped fewer African Americans and Latino citizens by the thousands.

Through the work of our own Office of the Inspector General, we have caught trends that needed to be looked into and have opened audits on the pointing of a firearm, uses of force, pursuits, hiring and training, and a host of other issues important to community policing and running a Police Department on best practices.

Even the monitor has noted that on the audit on reporting use of force, all, not some but all of the underlying uses of force were constitutional and done with professionalism.

Finally, I do want to speak for a moment about the plaintiffs' focus on the concerns publicly raised by the Oakland Black Officers Association regarding the Department's

recruiting and background efforts.

While I cannot speak publicly about some of the personnel issues involved in this matter, I do want the Court to know that my approach to this issue is consistent with the City's values and the Department's overall commitment to self-reflection, transparency, and transformation.

In this particular case, at my direction Deputy Director Gleason has led an overhaul of how we recruit background with a special emphasis on eliminating practices that could have disparate impact on African Americans, Latinos, and female recruits.

And just last week I asked the director of the City's

Department of Race and Equity to assist us in examining and

addressing the concerns addressed by the OBOA letter. I have

asked her to be thorough and probing, and I have asked her to

show us the path forward. She will begin next week, and I've

told her our goal is nothing short of cultural change and

legitimacy.

The Department is making other important advances. We are in the process of transforming how we train those new police recruits with an emphasis on officers as guardians and problem solvers and not warriors or soldiers. We are not at war with our community.

We have drafted one of the most progressive policies on probation and parole searches in America, and our renewed focus

on violent crime and intelligence-led policing has helped us drop out of the top 10 list of the most violent cities in America.

Your Honor, in closing, I do want you to know that I respect the role of this Court, the monitor, and the plaintiffs' attorneys. Our intellectual disagreements will not hamper my work or the Department's efforts to work with them and our Police Commission to achieve a sustainable reform and continued transformation of the Oakland Police Department. We are going to be nothing but the best police agency in this country.

I believe deeply in police accountability and with that, I will support officers when they have done nothing wrong and I will not hesitate to discipline when corrections need to be made. I am proud to be the Chief of Police of Oakland and I believe in this Police Department. I do see a path forward for not only bringing us into complete compliance but transformation and sustainability.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

All right. From the plaintiffs, who's -- Mr. Chanin.

MR. CHANIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

When discussing the Pawlik case, I will refrain from discussing many but not all of the specific details in this case since it will ultimately be decided in other forums, such

as a civil case filed in federal court and the discipline process pursuant to the decisions of the Police Commission, the compliance director, and the process pursuant to the Police Officers Bill of Rights and the MOU agreement between the Oakland Police Officers Association and the City of Oakland.

However, there are aspects of the Pawlik case that must be discussed here. As you said, Your Honor, there are tasks that will undoubtedly be affected by the monitor, compliance directors, and the Court's view of the quality of the OPD's investigation into the death of Joshua Pawlik on March 11th, 2018.

In fact, Task 30 was recently declared out of compliance in significant part due to the Oakland Police Department's handling of the Pawlik case. That task has been in compliance since 2014. I agree with the monitor's decision in this matter.

In December 2015, OPD General Order K-4.1 was issued and still governs the operation of Force Review and Executive Force Review Boards. An important change in the process was that without changing the standards and rules governing discipline, the OPD Force Review Boards were charged with analyzing the use of force incident to identify deficient or exceptional performances as they related to a wide variety of issues, including but not limited to Department policy or procedure revision, any tactics, strategies, and options pursued as

events unfolded that may have led to the use of force, and additional training that may be required or existing training that may need to be made more frequent.

Under the new state law that took effect on January 1st, the entire Executive Force Review Board report on this case was recently made public. So everything that I discuss today is already part of the public record.

A review of the EFRB report shows that there was little reported discussion of alternative tactics that could have led to an outcome consistent with officer safety which would have saved Mr. Pawlik's life.

The City says otherwise in its portion of the case management conference statement, and I have heard there was discussion of positioning of the BearCat and less than lethal options, but I did not see what I expected in the written EFRB report. Instead, there was an extensive series of deliverables recommended, some of which are listed on page 8 of the plaintiffs' portion of the case management conference statement and the rest are set forward on pages 47 to 49 of the FRB report.

Plaintiffs' attorneys will be closely examining whether and how soon OPD effectively produces these deliverables and improves its training on responding to unconscious or nonresponsive armed people, which at this point is inadequate at best.

I believe the EFRB missed an important opportunity to have a more robust discussion of how Mr. Pawlik's life could have been saved consistent with officer safety and, equally important, to memorialize the discussion in the EFRB report for future use.

These people at the EFRB were the ideal group to discuss and memorialize in writing the possibility of alternative tactics that could have saved Mr. Pawlik's life. They sat for three days and listened to testimony on this case. Maybe this discussion did take place, but it was not reduced to writing.

Obviously there was discussion as evidenced by the impressive list of deliverables, as well as the Internal Affairs training and policy recommendations on page 36 of the FRB report; but a specific discussion as to what, if any, alternative tactics could have been employed to save Mr. Pawlik's life is not in the report.

And I would call upon the chief to reconvene the FRB and have them discuss such alternative tactics as part of their review of the whole Pawlik incident. It would not be disciplinary. It would just be what can we do to do better next time.

Sergeant Jones testified at the FRB that there was no training as to how to respond to armed nonresponsive persons outside the OPD basic academy. In other words, an officer who had been on the force for 20 years had not received this

training in 20 years, absent some clearly inadequate, nonspecified training on critical incidents referred to on page 7 of the FRB report.

Given that the Pawlik shooting is at a minimum the third death of an armed nonresponsive person in the history of the negotiated settlement agreement, this lack of training is completely unacceptable.

Reading the account of the lieutenant and sergeant in charge of the Pawlik operation, it is hard to believe that either of them were extensively trained on the operation of the designated arrest team and the duties and leader of the DAT. Sergeant Jones testified at the FRB hearing there is no specific training to supervisors regarding the supervision of DATs.

The sergeant in charge of the Pawlik incident almost completely abandoned his role as leader of the designated arrest team, which was to think of, and I quote, "possible contingencies based on the scenario at hand and formulate response plans," quoting Sergeant Jones at page 8 of the FRB report.

He allowed multiple -- that's the sergeant -- allowed multiple officers to give Mr. Pawlik commands almost simultaneously and, in fact, one of them was in the middle of giving a command when the shots were fired.

He took the role of both team leader and talker/cuffer,

which split his attention and did not allow him to effectively supervise the team. That's on page 43 of the FRB report. And he participated in shooting Mr. Pawlik even though there were two designated officers with rifles as primary cover officers.

As for the lieutenant on the scene, his presence at the scene had no real value at all. He failed to tell the sergeant to put away his rifle and concentrate on leading the designated arrest team. He expressed total confidence in his sergeant's ability to run the operation to the point where he effectively abandoned his own assignment.

His conduct was the only conduct that the four entities who looked at this -- Internal Affairs, the FRB, Chief Kirkpatrick, and the monitor -- could agree on. That agreement was to sustain the lieutenant's conduct as a Class II violation.

Recently I have been informed by OPD members that there are more than 10 incidents that the Department has resolved in confrontations with armed nonresponsive persons by not killing -- and they have not killed the subject. I look forward to hearing more about these incidents but, more importantly, I hope that OPD members study these incidents for innovative ideas as to how to resolve more of these situations, again consistent with officer safety, without killing the armed person.

The OPD EFRB policy says the review process is intended to

help the Department achieve its goal of using the least amount of force consistent with the safety of all persons. The Oakland Police Department has a reverence for life. There is no doubt that the number of officer-involved shootings has fallen dramatically in recent years. That being said, the coming months will determine if the promise of the EFRB policy that the Oakland Police Department has a reverence for all life is true for some of us or for all of us, including the homeless and the mentally ill.

I would like to compliment the compliance director and the monitor team for their work on this matter. As we said in our case management statement, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the compliance director's decision to overrule the Oakland Police Department on the Pawlik case was the driving force for the recent explosion of activity by the OPD in dealing with the problem of armed unresponsive citizens.

This does not reassure us that the OPD will undertake this kind of proactive activity when we are gone, especially when one considers this problem is a recurring issue that has gone on for many years.

Once we believe that the Oakland Police Department can make mistakes, as we all do, and deal with it in a forthright manner on their own, there will be no need for this case to continue.

At the last case management conference, I addressed the

Court about the rise in the Oakland Police Department's use of force and the alarming failure of a significant number of officers who failed to report the use of force, the increase in the number of complaints against Oakland police officers, the rise in the number of pursuits, and the alarming lack of women recruits in the Oakland Police Academy.

There have been a number of developments to address the underreporting of the use of force. The OPD Office of Inspector General has analyzed 14 cases identified by the monitor in one of their recent reports. The Police Department has agreed that nine of the uses of force identified by the monitor as not reported should, in fact, have been reported, while five of them were not instances of force that should have been reported per the current force policy.

As a result, 11 cases were sent to Internal Affairs for nonreporting use of force, supervision problems related to the nonreporting of force, and ancillary problems that were identified by the OIG review of the PDRDs in question.

The Office of Inspector General then looked at the third and fourth quarter reports -- that's up to November of 2018 -- involving use of force using similar methodology used by the monitor. Of the 80 cases reviewed, the OPD OIG identified 17 in which they wanted to look at the associated PDRDs. As a result, there were additional referrals to Internal Affairs due to the failure to report the use of force. Training and

supervision problems were also noted.

The OIG then sorted uses of force reports by squads to see if the failure to report use of force was a systemic problem and/or a more isolated problem involving a smaller number of officers who were not reporting their use of force.

As a result of this process, four outlier squads were identified that had basically unexplainable very low use of force statistics compared with other squads in the OPD. These squads stop data statistics were then examined as part of an overall review to see if the sharp decline in stopping African Americans was as great as has been reported.

There are no conclusive statistics to report at this point. However, despite the possible correlation of these four squads with underreporting stop data statistics, the overall decline in the stopping of African Americans in Oakland appears to be valid at this point.

There are also efforts to review the use of force policy to correct ambiguities and problems raised by the monitor in their reviews. The Oakland Police Department reports several meetings on this issue to address problems of interpretation regarding pointing a firearm at a person and to ensure collection of data anytime officers are using force during a detention or arrest.

One of these changes is to remove the word "intentional" from language regarding the pointing of a firearm and using new

language that will have a simple yes-or-no test. This will compel officers to report their pointing a firearm at a person without inserting the issue of whether the pointing was intentional or not.

This new policy is a work in progress, as was said earlier, which has not been finalized or approved by the IMT, plaintiffs' attorneys, or the Police Commission. We met this morning and we all agreed to move this as quickly as we possibly can. The Police Commission has 120 days to act, but the Police Department is going to try and contact them and move this along faster than 120 days.

Overall, there is a lot of activity in the area of use of force but no definitive policy, no final decision on the cases referred to Internal Affairs by the Office of Inspector General, and no subsequent test to see if the failure to report uses of force has been discouraged by all this activity. There is also no reliable data on uses of force at the current time.

And, Your Honor, you asked: Are you confident that the statistics on use of force are accurate? My answer is no, I have no confidence at all in that.

And the data that does exist shows a massive increase that we reported on page 6 of our case management conference statement. The size of this increase from 76 to 331 comparing March of 2018 to March of 2019 calls into question the validity of much of the OPD's statistics regarding use of force in past

years.

It also calls into question whether the increase in use of force, particularly in Level 3 and 4 uses of force, are systemic problems and if not, in addition to the isolated problem -- and that's in addition to the isolated problem with force reporting by a few squads, which I mentioned earlier.

The relentless rise in complaints since 2015, which is documented in our case management conference statement, is still largely unexplained by the OPD. There needs to be an accounting as to how many of these complaints involved excessive force, discourtesy, or other types of complaints that indicate a problem that must be addressed.

If the increase is largely due to so-called service complaints, such as complaints that the officer took too long to arrive, this may indicate a resource problem or a deployment problem that could possibly be addressed. In any event, the only way to see if this explanation -- if there is an explanation for this increase is to analyze it and not to speculate about it.

The rise in complaints may well indicate a serious problem that is capable of a solution. The rise in pursuits is also detailed in our case management conference statement.

THE COURT: Mr. Chanin, I'm doing what I often do in trials. I'm looking down at the length of the examination that's going on or the speech, and I see a lot left; and so --

```
It's not much, Your Honor.
 1
              MR. CHANIN:
                          -- so what I'd like -- so I have two
 2
              THE COURT:
     things.
              One is, I'd like you to file what you have --
 3
                           I don't have it that way but I will.
 4
              MR. CHANIN:
 5
              THE COURT: -- on ECF just so I can read the whole
 6
     thing; and then if you would just summarize for me the
     remaining high points, that would be very helpful.
 7
              MR. CHANIN: Okay. So let's talk -- let's move on and
 8
     talk about the number of stops that has dropped from 19,185 to
 9
     10,874, a 43 percent drop from 2017 to 2018.
10
11
          What I want to say about this, and this is important and
     it's not in our case management conference statement, is what
12
     this indicates is that approximately 8,000 stops of African
13
     Americans who were stopped in 2017 were most likely detained
14
15
     without any discernible impact on the Oakland Police
16
     Department's core mission of fighting crime.
17
          Since the 2017 statistics are typical and not an
     aberration, this indicates a staggering number of African
18
19
     Americans who have been stopped for many years with no impact
20
     on crime.
          This has caused a dramatic impact on the African American
21
     community, which has undoubtedly contributed to the justifiable
22
23
     fear and anger, the getting of records by young black men, and
```

These Oakland statistics are not atypical and the only

decline in police community relations.

24

25

difference between them and the other cities in most of California is that most American cities have done nothing to address this problem, and it is going on today just as it has gone on for many, many years.

The stop data figures are in no small part due to the OPD's risk management meetings, which isolate squads and officers with outlier stop data statistics and hold their commanders accountable for their problems.

I've attended a number of these meetings and I am impressed by the thoroughness and probing questions. The one improvement I would like to see is a more thorough accounting of the deliverables ordered as a result of these risk management meetings. I believe the follow-through on this issue can be improved. Overall, however, I am impressed with this process and hope that these figures will improve in the future.

Last page, Your Honor.

The academy class that just graduated, unlike the last one, does have four women out of 25 graduates. This is not enough, especially considering there are no African American women who have graduated from the academy for the last two classes.

The good news is there are a large number of Latinos, including three out of four of the women graduates. However, there are only four African Americans in the class, well below

the average of African Americans in Oakland and less than is needed given the problems involving OPD's police community relations in the African American community.

One note on PRIME. We've been told that there are some problems integrating the PDRD videos with the PRIME system and that officers are going to insert something, I'm not a techie, but something into some sort of machine that's going to transfer the PDRD into the PRIME system. I would like to see that and be assured that it's working because the initial plan, which was to integrate the videos with PRIME, has not worked out and we learned that recently.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. CHANIN: Finally, no mention of the recent developments concerning the Police Academy can be complete without a reference to the letter from the Oakland Black Officers Association, which was recently published in the Oakland Post, a local paper. This letter raises very serious issues that appear to have validity given the personnel action taken by the mayor and the City administrator.

There are also questions as to whether the OBOA's initial complaints fell on deaf ears when presented to the highest levels of the Police Department.

These developments and more will be discussed by John Burris who will go next. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Telescoped, Mr. Burris.

MR. BURRIS: I only have two.

(Laughter)

MR. BURRIS: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

Obviously the big issues that I think that the Court raised are fundamental issues that go to the very essence of what this case is about and how we would like to leave it when it's over when we leave, and that's the cultural question.

You know, I wrote in 1999 before this case started about Oakland and the culture and the impediments that I thought that culture presented as it relates to constitutional policing, and so obviously when the *Riders* case happened, and I was very pleased with the opportunity to sort of tackle these particular issues. Unfortunately, I didn't expect to be here 20 years later but sobeit, I am here.

Part of the reasons why I wanted to deal with the discipline study issue is because I believed that it would give us some indication as to what the culture was in the Department as it relates to how officers are treated, which I think is very, very important because a culture cannot be straight up and fair if there are people within the Department feeling that they're being treated in a disparate way.

And so hopefully this study, as we have now finally gotten to the point where it's going to get off the ground, that we should be able to start this -- get the -- have the data

collection process start pretty soon, and hopefully at the end of the process we'll be in a position to determine what procedures and processes should be in place to guarantee that discriminatory conduct treatment of officers will not occur in the future. That's the hole.

However, unfortunately there's a giant hole in all of that because it did not -- in terms of the study and certainly in my own lack of understanding, that did not include the hiring and recruiting process even though fundamentally I understood that that was important going forward because it considers the first step in the process; and how that conduct -- how people are treated at that step really determines whether they get in or not, and then they become a function -- they function within the Department.

Well, that process that we put together in terms of the employment, the disparity study, did not include that. And so I have had -- I did have conversations with Captain Millington about this before this letter came about, and really thinking through my concerns about this issue, and we had discussions about it and certainly that issue has developed even more so now. We've heard the chief talk about it. We've had other more discussions about it.

But to me it is an extraordinarily important area and how do we determine that people who want to be police officers are not arbitrarily dismissed or knocked out for a person's

arbitrary notions about what it should be or should not be in terms of a police officer.

Now, this is not a new process because I've had many discussions down through the years with other people, and they would tell me that there are personnel issues. And I hate to say it's personnel driven, but this is a people office and people in certain positions make decisions that eliminate -- apply their own personal criteria to who can become a police officer or not.

And I'm concerned that that sort of process has created a situation where African Americans, men and women, Hispanics, have not received fair consideration, or I should say fair consideration in terms of criteria that's equally applied to them as it applies to others.

And so the letter from the OBOA, which to me goes as much to culture, the culture that exists within the Department as it does in terms of being concerned about who gets hired and who doesn't get hired. Because when they talk about unfair bias treatment in personnel decisions and unfair bias

Internal Affairs investigations and disciplines, then overlooking qualified black officers and members of the -- for assignments and positions, bias and unfair treatment of black Africans during hiring, academy, and the field training program, this kind of goes to the essence of the Department itself.

And if there is this feeling or this belief that African

American officers are being sort of marginalized early in the

process even before they get in and then once they get in, even

marginalized further, then you have a situation where the

culture itself is not working fairly to everyone.

And it is true that this NSA is going to get completed. The Is are going to be dotted and the Ts are going to get crossed, but that is not going to be where we want to end it. We want to know that there's an issue of sustainability here and that whatever we have planted now, that it will grow and we will see and others will see that what has taken place here has left its mark and it's left its mark in such a way that new officers, some young person in West Oakland or East Oakland or Walnut Creek who wants to be a police officer will have a fair opportunity of being that and not being eliminated or marginalized as a consequence of some arbitrary standard.

So what I think is necessary is that a set of criterias has to be developed by the Department that sets forth a mechanism for recruiting and for ultimately hiring new people and that it's consistently applied to go along.

Now, maybe that can be part of the consistency study or a by-product of it, but I am concerned about it, and I do want to know that efforts are being made to allow for young people, people -- old people, whoever want to come into the Department, will not be judged by some person's discretion or arbitrary

notions about what the criteria is of being an officer.

I have no doubt and I don't question the credibility or the professionalism of the chief or Ms. Gleason or any of the other people who have presented today or the Department itself. I'm only concerned about how we are going to treat people who come to this Department aside from the other issues about racial profiling and all that. That's being dealt with and Jim and the others have talked about it. But this is an issue that I think is important as it relates to the culture of the Department and the future culture of the Department, and I think this Court should be mindful of that and we should have some standards and approach that allows us to address itself to these issues in the very near future.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Lucia?

MR. LUCIA: Your Honor, the OPOA has nothing further at this point.

THE COURT: All right. So I think one thing, for the next status conference I'm going to have a slightly different procedure and anybody who wants to make a statement about things that aren't in the -- that they haven't already said in the joint status reports should file it two days in advance so that everybody can take a look at it, and then we can explore more specifically the points that people want to raise.

This is a charged moment in this case and I understand that people wanted to make their points, which is fine; but I think we're going to continue -- I'm going to continue to have status reports and conferences because I want to know what's going on and I want to know that there is the progress that the chief believes is happening is happening and is reflected in the facts and the evidence throughout the various sources of information that we get.

So I want that, and I don't -- and I am glad that everybody has high-minded hopes and I have high-minded hopes, but what I want to see is on-the-ground facts of transformation that the chief was describing. That's what I want to see, and that is going to -- it starts -- I'm very happy to see the leadership of the City here and you're taking time out from so many different important things, and so I'm grateful that you're here and I'm glad that you heard what I had to say.

Because I really think at the end of the day, this is the City, this is the City's responsibility and it's not something that is going away, as you can tell because it's been here for 15 years. You haven't, Mayor Schaaf, but --

MAYOR SCHAAF: I have -- 20 years I've been with the City of Oakland.

THE COURT: Okay. So you've seen this and the court part of it needs to stop. The court part needs to end, but it can't end until the City and the Police Department are taking

```
full responsibility for making sure that there is
 1
 2
     constitutional policing, that it's not somebody from the
     outside who's prodding you, that this is all something that is
 3
     internal and it's built into what the City -- it's built into
 4
 5
     the DNA of the force and the leadership of the City.
     that's not true now, and I am hopeful that it's going to be and
 6
     it will be obvious over the next few status reports.
 7
          So the next one I'd like to schedule for August 21st at
 8
     3:30. By that time I expect that VISION will be fully
 9
10
     implemented and maybe, if I'm not in trial, I'll have an
11
     opportunity to have come over and see what it looks like.
          So thank you-all for your presentations, and I will see
12
     you in August.
13
14
                   (Proceedings adjourned at 5:04 p.m.)
15
                                 ---000---
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Friday, April 26, 2019 DATE: g andergen Jo Ann Bryce, CSR No. 3321, RMR, CRR, FCRR U.S. Court Reporter